

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

UNITY

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL LIBRARY

CONTENTS

Editorial Comments	35
Is Organized Religion the Source of Today's Moral Impasse?.....	37
<i>Oscar Riddle</i>	
The London Humanist Congress.....	40
<i>Alfred Stiernotte</i>	
Religious Liberals and Modern India.....	47
<i>Homer A. Jack</i>	
Dogma Is Its Own Enemy—II.....	50
<i>Sunder Joshi</i>	
Reconciliation—How?	53
<i>Lloyd F. Merrell</i>	
Bookman's Notebook	56
Western Unitarian Conference.....	60

MAY-JUNE, 1958

VOL. CXLIV, No. 2

PRICE FIFTY CENTS

U N I T Y

Established 1878

RANDALL S. HILTON, *Editor*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

HOMER A. JACK—"Religious Liberals and Modern India"—is Minister of the Unitarian Church of Evanston, Illinois, and is editor of *The Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi* and *The Gandhi Reader*.

SUNDER JOSHI—"Dogma Is Its Own Enemy"—is Minister of the Unitarian Church of Hinsdale, Illinois.

LLOYD F. MERRELL—"Reconciliation—How?"—is a retired Congregational Minister living in Jackson, Michigan.

OSCAR RIDDLE — "Is Organized Religion the Source of Today's Moral Impasse?"—is a biologist, and author of *Unleashing Evolutionary Thought*.

ALFRED STIERNOTTE — "The London Humanist Congress"—is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Quinnipiac College, New Haven, Connecticut.

Published bimonthly except during July and August
by the

Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago 15, Illinois

Subscription \$2.

Single Copies 50 cents.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editorial Comments



A dinner commemorating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of The Chicago Ethical Society, we were privileged to hear Dr. Jacob P. van Praag speak. Dr. van Praag is president of the International Humanist and Ethical Union and comes from the Netherlands. His espousal of a genuine ethical liberalism and naturalistic Humanism was most refreshing. So many times in the past we have been disappointed by European religionists and philosophers who were hailed as "liberals" only to discover that their concepts had not gone beyond American Christian Modernism. To hear the voice of a truly liberal European is of importance. We wish he could have stayed longer, travelled wider, and addressed many more audiences in this country.

We were greatly annoyed by the treatment of Dr. Linus Pauling on the popular TV program "Meet the Press." The panel of so-called news and interview experts seemed determined to smother Dr. Pauling's "story" under a landslide of smears. The program announces that the questions may not represent the views of the reporters but that it is their

way of getting a story. In this case they were eminently successful in not getting the Pauling story. Two nights later we heard Dr. Pauling address 1,800 social workers at the Morrison Hotel in Chicago. What he has to say is of primary concern to every citizen of America and every nation in the world. To ignore his warning on radiational fallout and atomic testing is to refuse to face the scientific facts known and accepted by the overwhelming majority of nuclear physicists, bio-chemists, and geneticists. To let our hatred and fear of Russia blind us to truth is to perpetuate a great disservice to our country and to mankind.

Dr. Dana MacLean Greeley is the new President of the American Unitarian Association. He won over Dr. Ernest W. Kuebler, the candidate of the Board of Directors, by a very small margin. Reports indicate that both Dr. Greeley and the Board of Directors are trying to span the breaches and heal the wounds caused by this hotly contested election. If they can succeed in this without retarding progress or making compromises with conservatism, then there is hope for the continued advance of liberalism.

Dr. Ernest W. Kuebler continues as the Director of the Council of Liberal Churches. The Council provides the educational leadership and program for both the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America. The outstanding success of Dr. Kuebler and the Council is most amazing in light of the limited funds with which it is provided. We are aware of the difficult financial problems which face Unitarians and Universalists, and yet some way must be found to give the Council a more adequate budget.

We do not know how much Dr. Greeley had to say about the conduct of his campaign for the presidency of the American Unitarian Association. We hope not much, for it was conducted on a level beneath the dignity of the office he sought and obtained. Whether there is another contested election or not there should be established some procedures, "rules of the game," which are on a higher level than ward politics and more ethical than profes-

sional public relations propaganda. At a minimum there should be an accounting of the sources of income and the nature of campaign expenditures. A few principles of "good taste" might be helpful, too. Unitarians have prided themselves upon building a "Unity of Spirit amidst a Diversity of Convictions." This can only be done when there is understanding based on mutual respect.

Several of our Editorial Comments during the past year have been stimulated by reactions to sermons which we have heard. Those interested in reading for themselves the sermon, a portion of which we described as "a subtle and circuitous rationalization for liberal religionists to stay within the Christian tradition in order that we might 'save' Christianity," can do so by writing for a copy of "Can Liberalism Save Christianity?" by Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, Minister of the First Unitarian Society, 1174 E. 57th Street, Chicago, Illinois. If you get it and read it, we invite your comment.

Some Future Articles of Interest

Our Uncommitted Nation.....By John M. Morris
 How Much Certainty Does Science Give Us?.....By Paul E. Killinger
 The Origin of Good and Evil.....By Oscar Riddle

Is Organized Religion the Source of Today's Moral Impasse?*

OSCAR RIDDLE

IN AND around this most controversial of subjects lurk more than one oversight and misunderstanding. It is this confusion—together with our social unreadiness to clear it up—that has led to the impasse of which we speak. And even this present attempt to examine the subject is perhaps an error of judgment. Nevertheless, choice was based on the premise that this question is actually new to our time, that very few recognize it as today's prime social problem, and that I can now discuss no other aspect of morality of equal importance.

That importance becomes somewhat clearer when we merely change the words of our title from the form of query to that of affirmation. If the results of a full and satisfactory examination of this matter led to the conclusion that "organized religion is the source of today's moral impasse" a large faction of today's scholarship would at once face a broad new area of human choice and then act—and this is the precise

area of morality. If that segment of our scholarship reversed its present position we should soon get better social and political leadership; and with that help we might be able to chart a course with no blind end. For, that part of our scholarship which now both rejects naturalism and provides props to established religion, also thus automatically assists religion in a dangerous censorship of all levels of education and of all our modern avenues of communication. However, the ranks of that laggard scholarship would surely weaken if forced to face *directly* an adverse verdict against "organized religion." Therefore, we here charge that part of our scholarship *and* organized religion with joint responsibility for today's moral impasse—and, indeed, with prime responsibility for the now impending threat to all civilization.

We here deal with two issues. One, does a "moral impasse" actually exist, and what is its nature? The other, is "organized religion" responsible for that impasse? Two areas of evidence for the existence of this impasse will here be named,

*Address to The American Humanist Association in Chicago on the evening of March 1, 1958.

and must then be dropped from pursuit. We first meet the simple but withering fact that, at this moment, the tie-in between religion and education has never yet been broken—indeed, cannot be broken—in any Western nation. Since the work of the French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, a half century ago, we could understand this situation. He showed us that, up to his day, education had been “only the image, the reflection, of society and does not create it.” The *new* thing is that this cultural handicap, though at least bearable while shared with everyone, has now become disastrous once one great nation—one powerful industrially, politically, and militarily—has cut that tie and reaped the immense rewards of doing so.

The second area of such evidence is more localized and belongs especially to the American scene. The thing or things involved go under such names as anti-intellectualism, conformity, security, “organization man.”

The third and central creator of this impasse is science—or much more accurately, science as it is still *fractured* in scholarship—and here, too, it is clear that organized religion is its opposite number as the fracturing agent. Advancing science has played the first of its two leading roles through convincing a part of scholarship that

man has a nature and stature never earlier comprehended; and its second or indirect part by fathering technology, through which it increasingly affects the daily problems and much of the environment of everyone. But the effect of real science, in contrast with that of technology, is left dim and unstated until it is fully understood that the main and immediate *outlet* of science is scholarship; and, as of now, only the less dominant, the socially less effective, segment of scholarship has accepted man in his new-found nature and dimension. For several decades that immense and inevitable transformation of learning has been left suspended in mid-air. There it still is. Practically all Catholic scholarship and very, very much of that outside it continue to subordinate man to an outside force—to a God, or to a “universe of spirit”—to which the person has a moral commitment superior to his commitment to man. That truly basic division of thought within our intellectual leadership has progressively led the Western world into a schizoid culture—schizoid at its growing top, where it is socially most disruptive.

A fourth and precipitating aspect of this moral impasse emerged only forty years ago. It came in the form of a new ideology that

embraced a callous morality and a deep social and economic revolt—all geared to sharp new tools of ruthless, world-wide proselytism. This was unleashed by a biologically gifted people—a people repressed for centuries by church, by state, by nobility—and at a time when the wealth and comfort of the West were becoming visible, sensed and resented by the hungry and hopeless hordes of the East. The immense strength, and the proselyting drive, innate to this situation were shamelessly overlooked even by the lethargic leadership of the West. So superficial has been our own diagnosis that, at this moment, official Washington proclaims the *atheism* of the USSR a prime handicap to them and an ally of ours in the portentous struggle in progress. This, they assert despite the now wholly clear demonstration that the first nation that ever swept religion completely from its schools could start with 70 per cent illiteracy only forty years ago and now annually graduate many more scientists and engineers than does the United States. Thus, a minor fragment of the present moral impasse surely reposes in this our ruinous inability to state our most pressing problem of personal and national *survival* in terms better than equivocal and partly untrue.

Precisely in this year 1958 scientists celebrate the centenary of the

“natural selection” of Darwin and Wallace. The *historical* perspective thus places nearly *sixty* years between the lucid Darwin of 1859 and the coming of the Russian revolution of 1917, and forty years since that event. During those sixty years the sort of God that attends or corrects the ills of men had been clearly and completely *dethroned* in science. Why was he not also dethroned by the peoples having access to that new knowledge? Can any informed person be found who will place that failure and that responsibility on another source than the organized religions? Even the loitering scholarship which we also indict is mainly the product of religious conditioning.

The harshness of this indictment is not lessened by the circumstance that a laggard but socially predominant part of Western scholarship has meanwhile given its aid and comfort to those established religions. Yes, to this moment, even some good scientists still find ways and words to aid those religions. But the evidence and the record fully support the indictment. That Russian revolution was rooted not merely in furious proletarian protest, but also in the sane and politically constructive battles of a part of the Russian gentry—battles whose effectiveness became evident in the short-lived Duma of 1905.

Those men often have been described as "the wonderfully idealistic and wonderfully dedicated Russian intelligentsia"; and their persisting strength during some months following the Czar's abdication is known to us all. If these men, along with many of their rabid and anti-religious co-workers, could have pointed to five or six decades of dethronement of the man-serving God in one or more nations of the West, what would have been the results in history? Who will doubt that a timely discard of supernaturalism by the West would have dulled the Communist ax before

it was fashioned? Indeed, in that case, can we do other than conceive the Russian revolt as patterned upon the new and immense release of other Western men? How escape the conclusion that the virulence of the present Communist threat to the West was both increased and produced by those religious forces which still committed nations to supernaturalism long after science had discarded it?

The whole of history offers no competing example of the frightening social and political consequences of outgrown religious belief.

The London Humanist Congress*

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

I WENT to the London Congress of the International Humanist and Ethical Union as an observer, resolved to observe, to participate, and to evaluate the discussions carried on by the various sections and national groups, and thereby to be better informed concerning the various trends of thought and belief which are commonly understood by the all-comprehensive

name of Humanism. I did not go as a completely convinced humanist in the extreme free-thinking sense of the term, but rather as one eager to know more about humanist and ethical movements in Great Britain, in Europe, and elsewhere, and to ascertain whether these movements were repeating what had already been said by American humanists or whether they had distinctive approaches which promoted the variety and enrichment of the move-

*From a report on the London Congress of the International Humanist and Ethical Union, July 1957.

ment as a whole.

Humanism is defined by Professor M. C. Otto as "loyalty to the human venture." Humanists often take as their aim the well-known maxim by the ancient Roman writer, Terence: "I am a man, and I find nothing human uninteresting." This great saying has also been translated: "Nothing human shall be foreign to me." Whether humanists and rationalists have always been true to the many-sided implications of this statement remains to be seen.

The Congress discussed four subjects concurrently in four different sections and these were: Personal Life, Social Life, Organization, and Philosophy. I naturally attended the section on Philosophy and I am able to report more adequately what took place in this section than what was discussed in other sections.

I had the pleasure to meet Professor Julian Huxley. He made the significant remark that "we should translate into humanist terms the central Christian idea of the great value of the individual as a child of God." I had the feeling that Professor Huxley would be prepared to give a larger cosmic setting for human values than is done by some rationalists and agnostics who turn their back on the universe and deal with human hopes and aspirations sep-

arated from the cosmos out of which they have emerged.

The French delegate, Mr. Cottereau, was indeed a stirring personality who with typical French exuberance attempted to speak on many, many occasions. Mr. Cottereau explained that the French Republic had been created by many movements and men which could be called in a broad sense, rationalistic and humanistic. He stated that these forces are still organized in many separate societies which work for specific humanistic goals, such as the rights of man, social legislation, but it would seem that it is as difficult for these various societies to federate into a French humanist union as it is for a French government to be formed which is able to unite on the support of many French political parties.

A deeply committed ethical leader at the Congress was Mr. Matthew Ies Spetter, whose remarks on great social injustices and cruelty such as the suppression of freedom in Hungary, gave me the clear impression that in Mr. Spetter's philosophy we have a distinct Existentialist Humanism. He is so sensitive to present-day threats to human life that a good indication of his type of thought may be perceived from his statement: "Man makes his society just as he builds his sanity amidst the onslaught of circum-

stance." Mr. Spetter has a profound experience of European concentration camps, and he apparently speaks from the inner conviction that greatness in human life is represented by a heroic commitment to human values when the available data—in terms of man's inhumanity to man—cry aloud for action and dedication. This is what I would call Existentialist Humanism and ethics, a position which adds a new dimension to man's capacities and is much more elevating than the slow, pragmatic method which may wait so long for the facts to be gathered in that it will remain in complacency and indecision.

Professor Horace L. Friess of the Department of Philosophy, Columbia University, is a man of profound integrity, wide sympathies, fully aware of the complexity of the human situation and that no single nostrum, even the recommendation of science and democracy, provides a complete answer. Professor Friess was chairman of the committee which drew the final report of the Section on Philosophy and I was honored in being a member of this committee. I shall give you a few of the significant declarations:

"As fundamental convictions of contemporary Humanism, the Section showed decisive agreement on the following points:

(1) Humanist belief and con-

viction of life seeks to interpret life and the world by an appeal to human capacities and without starting from a particular revelation.

(2) Humanism considers an essential capacity of man to be a sense of value which has unarbitrary foundations in human nature.

(3) Humanism affirms the solidarity of mankind, being opposed to discrimination on racist, national, or creedal grounds.

(4) Humanism seeks the development of individuals as persons, and sees this as inseparable from their free and responsible participation in social relations. It aims at the development of these relations for the fullest possible human fellowship, self-understanding, and release of creative human energies.

(5) Humanism is concerned with the whole person in his natural, social, and universal relations. Humanism believes that creative imagination, as in the arts, can enrich man's existence in the temporal scene without recourse to dubious interpretations.

(6) Contemporary Humanism holds that cooperative enquiry and scientific method can provide man with the means for a larger measure of control over his own destiny and for increased fulfillment of human possibilities. It appreciates the moral values of

integrity, truthseeking, and humility that inhere in the scientific spirit.

(7) Humanism appeals to experience and reason for the justification of all beliefs, and holds that its own firm convictions must be subjected to the test of repeated examination in the light of further evidence.

(8) While Humanism firmly believes that great advances are possible for the species, the community, and for the individual, it recognizes that false utopian promises, and thinking in terms of abstractions without concrete elaboration are dangers to be avoided."

This is merely a statement of some of the convictions of the section on Philosophy.

There were other sections, such as that on Personal Life, chaired by Mrs. Priscilla Robertson, the brilliant editor of *The Humanist*; the section on Social Life, chaired by Professor G. R. Dalvi, Sidharth College, Bombay, India; and the section on Organization, chaired by Mr. D. Bronder of Germany.

Having presented all too little of the discussions, still I should like to give you a few definite impressions of Humanism as revealed at this Second World Congress. These will inevitably be subjective and indicate my particular interests and even biases.

First, I had the conviction that

Humanism was definitely an international movement not limited to the particular phase of Humanism present in the United States or any other nation, but manifesting a growing richness which I earnestly hope will be able to overcome whatever sectarian attitudes still remain in some aspects of the movement. This variety and diversity of Humanism was indeed encouraging. I have been at times reluctant to find any great value in the efforts of some vocal American humanists whose range of vision was limited to an acceptance of the findings of science, or a superficial view of the philosophy of science, without realizing that science itself must be directed to ethical ends. I have, however, the distinct feeling that such lack of insight is being slowly overcome by the religious humanists and ethical humanists who stress "an essential capacity of man to be a sense of value which has unarbitrary foundations in human nature." The center of interest at the Congress was, therefore, man as a creative being, faced with many individual and social problems, but resolutely facing these because he himself represents an emerging order of value which cannot be denied or suppressed as long as man is man.

Or again, there is a type of Humanism which declares that facts

and values are intimately connected, as indeed they are, but this type of Humanism imagines that by accepting the facts of science, you will acquire automatically the values implied by these facts. Hence such humanists speak a great deal about scientific facts but remain for the most part silent about the realm of values. The whole issue of facts and values is one which deserves fresh investigation.

Or again, there is a type of Humanism which supposes that the achievement of John Dewey obliterates all previous philosophic history and discussion. I am happy to say that I did not find in the writings of Dutch humanist philosophers that contempt for Plato and Aristotle which is sometimes found among American pragmatists.

I am happy to say also that these shortsighted and one-sided views of Humanism, which are sometimes found in the American movement, were more than counterbalanced by the richness of philosophic thought provided by the Dutch delegation, by the practical endeavors in the teaching of morality and ethics in secondary schools in which French and Belgian humanists are occupied, and by the ethical emphasis of British and American religious humanists.

Secondly, I felt that humanists

should take Humanism seriously. "Nothing human shall be foreign to me" is the great maxim which animates many humanists, but sometimes the interpretation of what is human is solely in terms of present-day social problems. There are vast areas of human interest and human excellence revealed in the literature and the arts of man, and this note of human creativity was sounded in discussions of the Congress. What is the humanist to think about the great paintings which can be seen in the National Gallery in London, in the Louvre in Paris, in the Uffizi and Pitti galleries in Florence and in the Vatican Museum in Rome, great paintings inspired by a theology which we no longer believe? Shall these great works of art be declared valueless? Obviously not, for they represent the aspirations of men of a certain age when theological conceptions did imply their sense of human destiny and of being part of a cosmic scheme greater than they were. I feel strongly that modern ethical and scientific humanists should drink deeply from the fountains of Renaissance Humanism, for this type of Humanism vindicated the creativity of man not merely in science or in theological discussion but in the arts and letters. If humanists are really aware of the implications of this important

judgment: "Nothing human shall be foreign to me," they must be prepared to enter intellectually and philosophically and appreciatively into any age, any national culture, any religious philosophy.

Isolationism is not merely a political term. There is a humanist isolationism which dwells overmuch on the technical problems of the philosophy of science, or on ancient theological discussions without dealing adequately with the challenge of Neo-Orthodoxy; or which believes that Positivism has said the last word in science and philosophy. But I firmly believe that such isolationism in the movement will be corrected by the cross-fertilization of ideas afforded by international congresses on Humanism and Ethical Culture.

Professor Friess' paper, "Humanist Mind in the Making," seems to represent the actual situation. The humanist mind must be kept open to the currents of thought and the changing experiences of men not merely in this age but in all ages so that whatever has enlarged the mind of man shall be gladly accepted and become part of our spiritual vision. Hence, I disagree with the remark of a Dutch delegate who said: "We need no one to teach us." On the contrary, I would suggest we must accept teachings

from any source if they bear on human creativity and on human values.

Third, I feel that humanists should take Nature seriously. The frequent affirmations of humanists and rationalists that they do not derive their values, their ethical insights, from any supernatural source, their resounding devotion to the philosophy of evolutionary naturalism should signify a greater attempt on their part to orient themselves to the evolutionary universe out of which man and all his values have emerged. The more we emphasize Nature as the cosmic setting for man's evolution, the more we should attempt in our philosophy to relate man to the cosmic environment which has produced him. Before the splendors of the cosmos man may feel himself insignificant, and yet it is this same man who has an awareness of these cosmic energies and splendors. Greater than the spectacles of the universe revealed by nuclear physics or by astronomy is the human spectacle of great souls of the past and the present, dedicated to universal values, and lifting us to their heights. But these heights of the human spirit have been produced by the universe. On strictly humanist and naturalistic grounds, these heights of the human spirit were not thrown into the universe

from some supernatural source; they emerged through a creative process which is full of mystery but which is nevertheless being investigated by philosophies of emergent evolution which range all the way from Bergson's *Creative Evolution* to a materialism of levels, as represented by Roy Wood Sellars and Marvin Farber, and which in no sense is a reductive, mechanical, materialism.

While humanists often disclaim metaphysics, an ontology of emergent evolution is implied in their attitude, and I personally look forward to a time when a more mature humanist philosophy will have a more clearly articulated cosmic orientation than it has today. To take Nature seriously means to take Nature as the creative process which has produced the significant personalities of ages, the seers and the prophets and social reformers who were advancing the cause of human fulfillment, who were giving greater horizons to the human spirit, and wings to the human soul. Such an attitude which embraces the Universe, which embraces also the quality of life which is found in the greatest of the race, which embraces the universal values which are incarnated in the supreme minds and souls of the race—such an attitude is religious Humanism.

Humanism may be considered

as a social movement designed to promote human welfare. Or Humanism may be considered as a movement vindicating the achievements of science and welcoming scientific discovery. Or, again, Humanism may be considered as a rationalist movement criticizing the obscurantism of much of the theology of the past and of the present. All these varieties of Humanism are significant but they are not yet religious Humanism. Religious Humanism must be characterized by the sense of exaltation at the glory of the emergence of the human spirit out of a universe which makes possible this emergence. In the words of Dr. J. P. van Praag, the founder of the Dutch Humanistisch Verbond, "Not until he experiences his participation in all-embracing reality can man, in the thought of religious Humanism, reconcile himself to existence and fully realize his destiny."

I should like to conclude with a quotation from the paper presented by Professor Horace L. Friess: "Whatever further religious meaning it may acquire, Humanism needs from the start a Promethean compassion for the lot of mankind. It must be able to face the whole 'passion of humanity' in its many forms with courage, and with understanding for the deep tensions of living conscience."

Religious Liberals and Modern India*

HOMER A. JACK

WHAT are the historic and continuing relations of liberal religion to modern India? This relationship began more than a century ago, when the Brahmins of Boston, Unitarians most, traded goods and ideas with the Brahmins of Bombay. Also early in the last century there was a friendly interchange between the Brahmo Samaj movement of India and both English and American Unitarianism. This happy connection has persisted. Some leaders of the Brahmo Samaj have been educated in Unitarian theological schools. In 1928, an American delegation, including Dr. Curtis Reese of Chicago, visited Calcutta to participate in the centenary of the founding of the Brahmo Samaj by Ram Mohun Roy (who was surrounded by Unitarians in Bristol, England, when he died in 1833). Since the visit of Doctor Reese, several Midwestern Unitarian ministers have had the privilege of speaking at Brahmo Samaj meetings in Calcutta.

Another connection of American religious liberalism with modern India was in the person of

Dr. Jabez T. Sunderland, perhaps remembered still in India today more than in America, although he was minister of the Fourth Unitarian Church of Chicago from 1876-78, and for many years thereafter was minister of the Unitarian Church in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Doctor Sunderland was first sent to India in 1896 by the British Unitarian Association and visited India often in the next three decades. He wrote frequently for the Indian press and published four books in India. His well-known, vigorous criticism of British imperialism, entitled *India in Bondage*, was promptly suppressed on publication by the British Government—a high honor! Doctor Sunderland was president of the India Home Rule League of America.

In India, Doctor Sunderland was helpful with Brahmo Samaj, but more so with a tiny band of Unitarians in the Khasi Hills of Assam, who were not converted by Unitarianism but originally by Calvinism. On their own accord these Indians became Unitarians because of their dissatisfaction with the orthodoxy of their own Calvinism. There is a school named in Doctor Sunderland's honor in Shillong. He is

*Delivered at the fourth annual Universalist-Unitarian dinner on March 28, 1958, featuring Vice-President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan of India.

still remembered in the Khasi Hills.

Another strong thread between American religious liberalism and India is in the person of Dr. John Haynes Holmes. He is the first and perhaps greatest interpreter of Mohandas Gandhi to America. Doctor Holmes discovered Gandhi early in the 1920s and he was the first to publicize him in our country, especially through the pages of UNITY. Doctor Holmes also published serially the great autobiography of Gandhi in UNITY, several decades before it was published in book form in America. Doctor Holmes was interested in the freedom of India, and he led a great group of Americans, including many Universalists and Unitarians, in the free India campaigns of the 1930s and early 1940s. I wish John Haynes Holmes could be here this evening. We do have a special message from him which follows:

"It is most kind of you to arrange for me to be present in spirit at this dinner in acclaim of India and of her noble son, Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan. I first saw and heard this great teacher and leader of his people, on the unforgettable occasion when, as the honored guest of the Community Church of New York, Doctor Radhakrishnan gave one of the earliest of his

great addresses to the people of America.

"It was a short distance, as space is reckoned these days, from New York to Benares where, on a later occasion, at a convocation of the University, I was received by Doctor Radhakrishnan in his capacity as Vice-Chancellor, and was granted at his hands the honorary degree of Doctor of Letters.

"I like to see in this interchange of public courtesies, a symbol of the binding and forever durable influences which unite two men not as individuals, merely, caught by some chance contiguity of circumstance, but as representatives of two nations, two peoples, two civilizations, two cultures, drawn gropingly yet irresistibly toward that 'unity of the spirit which is the bond of peace.'

"People not infrequently ask me under what magic touch I was moved to accept and then to seize an interest in Asia, and then a falling in love with India. The answer to this query is easy, for in home, and school, and church, there never was a time when I did not breathe the atmosphere of freedom for India. As I grew up, the cause of the emancipation of three hundred and fifty millions of people flamed before my eyes. When I came to college age,

and was facing truth, I was persuaded to espouse actively India's cause. Lafayette-minded Americans rose up to teach me and guide me, men like J. T. Sunderland, now long since dead, who gave the best service of a long life to India's people. Societies and movements, churches and religions, entered into the struggle on higher levels, as witness the Brahmo-Samaj, which is now entering upon the dusk of evening after a day of brilliant sunshine. I sometimes wonder if many Americans, or Indians, for that matter, know how much America has done for India in terms of mind and spirit. We did not wait for Gandhi, but were ready for him when he came.

John Haynes Holmes."

More recently there have been still other Universalist-Unitarian relations with a free India, from the work of the Unitarian Service Committee in sending a medical team to Madras and Bombay for two months in 1955 to the successful ambassadorship to India of Unitarian layman Mr. Chester Bowles. We also have a message from him:

"I extend my warmest greetings to you who are attending the fourth annual banquet of the Unitarian and Universalist

Churches of Greater Chicago. The theme of your meeting, the contribution of religious liberals to American-Indian relations; your principal speaker, Doctor Radhakrishnan; and the underlying purpose of your meeting, the continuation and the flourishing of close Indian-American relations, are all close to my heart, ever-present in my mind.

"The link between India and the United States, though a strong one, is a link that has been forged primarily by people of liberal understanding, and of sympathy, from both nations. To strengthen this link, to broaden this base of understanding and sympathy, is a task of great magnitude and importance. When I hear of gatherings such as yours, I am confident that we will succeed in our task. My warmest wishes for the success of your banquet, and my warmest personal regards to my friend, Doctor Radhakrishnan.

Chester Bowles."

Thus, we religious liberals have a heritage in our relation to India, one which we must call upon as we watch the largest democracy in the world struggle mightily with her second five-year plan, and without sufficient capital resources.

Swami Vivikananda, here in Chicago in September, 1893, said:

The crying evil in the East is not religion—they have religion enough—but it is bread that these suffering millions in India cry out for. It is an insult to starving people to offer them religion. You Christians who are so fond of sending out missionaries to save the souls of the heathen, why do you not try to save their bodies from starvation?

Those words were uttered sixty-

five years ago, but they are certainly pertinent today. As a clergyman of another faith—Catholic—said in Washington several weeks ago, “theirs is the burden of being underprivileged; ours is the burden of being overprivileged.” We overprivileged Universalists and Unitarians must lead the movement in America to give much more generously of our food and fortune to Asia and Africa, and especially to India.

Dogma Is Its Own Enemy—II

SUNDER JOSHI

Dogma and Comparative Religion

THE cross-fertilization of historic religions has been proven by both similarity and continuity of cultural ideas and values. If people will take the time to go to the library or the museum, they would not have to rely upon the infallibility of any theologian. People who study comparative religion are exposed to ideas of other religions, and do not shape their knowledge of *world* religions upon the basis of ignorance of such religions.

The real brotherhood of man can be achieved by understanding comparative religion which is the ideological basis of human relations.

When the dogmatist thinks that

his religion is unique (when it is not), then he picks fights with so-called pagan people and divides the world, and this is done in the name of brotherhood! The dogmatist also tries to convert Asiatic people to Christianity when history proves that some of the Christian ideas came from Asia in the first place. I would particularly refer to the ideas of heaven, hell, and Satan—these were imports from Persia. These ideas were inherited by Christianity from the Jews who were dominated by the Persians during the Exile, some 600 years before the Christian era. The dogmatist must shiver and shake to know that his favorite whipping-boy (Satan) is a figment of the Per-

sian imagination.

Dogma and History

The basic law of history is to recognize and keep separate the different periods of time. In other words, if one period follows another, then an idea which originates in the second period cannot be attributed to the first period. But that is exactly what the dogmatist does when he inserts a theological idea of a later date into an earlier period. We have shown how the dogmatist superimposes the context of the past upon the context of the present. He claims that a truth formed in any one context of time is equally true for all subsequent contexts of time. This is just as unscientific as when the dogmatist reverses his position and superimposes the present upon the past. This is to confess total ignorance of the historic sense. Let us illustrate what we mean:

In the New Testament, the Logos appears in the Gospel of John, which was a Greek product of the early second century A. D. Whereas, this is true *historically*, yet the dogmatist lifts the Logos idea out of its historic context and claims that this idea existed *before* time began! This is the *theological* interpretation which defies the logic of time. Thus a temporal idea is made to appear timeless.

Similarly, the dogmatist fails to recognize the difference between the three Jewish centers of (1) the *Greek* Judaism of Alexandria, (2) the *Hebraic* Judaism of Jerusalem, and (3) the *Exilic* Judaism of Babylon. The dogmatist does not appreciate what grave injustice he does by imposing the Greek Judaism of Alexandria upon the Hebraic Judaism of Jerusalem, and making people believe that what is true of one is also equally true of the other. The problems of the Jews and the Greeks were antagonistic, and there could be no uniform truth applicable to both alike.

Dogma and the Bible

In this connection it may also be of some interest to note that the dogmatist attributes the first five books of the Bible (The Pentateuch) to Moses. Higher criticism in our universities makes it very clear that there are at least four or five different documentary sources from which the Pentateuch came. In fact, the final form of the Pentateuch was not completed till about 400 B. C.

If Moses lived in 1300 B. C. and he actually wrote the Pentateuch as the dogmatist claims he did, then how could Moses have finished this writing some 900 years after his own death? Just how much faith can we put in the dogmatist?

The dogmatist says that the Bible is the Word of God. If this is so, then how can we account for the many contradictions in the Bible? It is obvious that the Bible is man-made and not God-given. Here are some of the contradictions:

In Psalm 51:5 and Romans 5:12, man is a great sinner. But in Psalm 8:5, man is "a little lower than the angels." In Proverbs 23:32 it is said that wine "biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder." But in 1 Timothy, 5:23, Paul says "drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake."

In the Bible we may also find justification for slavery, polygamy, the inequality of women, the stoning of juvenile delinquents, and many other things which are outlawed by modern society. Now if the dogmatist is right that the Bible is God's Word, then he would unconsciously be attributing social evils to God himself.

The dogmatist assumes that all Biblical revelation is infallible. If this be true, then contradictions in the Bible must also be true. How can truth and untruth both be true at the same time?

From the scientific point of view, this makes no sense. For example, in Matthew 1:16, it is said, "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom

was born Jesus, who is called Christ." But in the same chapter, verse 18, it is said, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost."

Either Jesus was the son of Joseph or he was the son of the Holy Ghost. It is a biological contradiction to say that Jesus had both human and divine fatherhood and was still born of a virgin.

Dogma and Jesus

This impossible situation arises because Paul, the father of Christian dogma, tries to reconcile irreconcilables. He takes the *human* Jewish Messiah and projects into him the *divine* savior-God idea of the Greeks. This idea is known by the word, "Kyrios" or Lord. This term was borrowed by Paul from the Gentiles who applied it to their own savior-gods in the Mediterranean world.

Jesus' Judaism was thus saddled with Paul's Greek ideas which came *later* in time and *after* the death of Jesus. How could Jesus be made responsible for Paul's theology? But that is exactly what the dogmatist does. Bible scholars tell us that Paul never saw Jesus. In fact, Jesus never heard of many of Paul's

ideas, nor the later creeds of Christianity. Much less could he have believed in what he never heard about.

If, as the dogmatist claims, the belief in the creeds or dogmas is the sign of a true Christian, then by this test it must be admitted that Jesus was not a Christian.

In fact, the word, "Christian," was first coined in Antioch long after Jesus. When he died, the first universal Christian Council of Nicaea (which totally identified Christ with God via the "Homousios" formula) was still some three hundred years in the future!

Reconciliation—How?

LLOYD F. MERRELL

THE Fellowship of Reconciliation must be more than words: more than mutual fellowship of the members: more than the zealous but often blind efforts of those who espouse the cause of bringing reconciliation to a prejudiced, warring race. To clarify our position and increase our effectiveness, we need to take stock of our motives and faith.

Too many of us cling fearfully to gods and beliefs spawned by wishful thinking and suckled with vain longing that are not only as useless as a vermiform appendix but are sources of infectious confusion, frustration, and postponement. It is not a matter of doing away with supernaturalism, but of recognizing that supernaturalism is the unborn potential of man.

Is man less divine because he

has discovered that divinity in varying degrees is inherent in all life and not outside the processes of life in the so-called cosmos? The lily is not less fragrant because her feet are in the muck. The lily is muck and bloom, plus all plant food. The lowly origin of man does not lessen his divinity. The irresistible appeal of Jesus lies in the fact that he started where we start and battled his way to divinity.

Man must choose between the sting and honey of the bee: between crucifixion of self versus slaughter of others for personal gain. Our hope of a world of concord is defeated by clinging to divisive concepts: God versus man; heaven versus earth; soul versus body; root versus fruit; theist versus humanist. The absentee deity man has dreamed is man's transcendent self; the ideals

glimpsed in this deity are the glow of the stars in the sky of man's brain, to be woven dawn after dawn into the pattern of life.

Worse even than the damning influence on reconciliation of the seven deadly sins of lust, greed, pride, gluttony, indolence, envy, and anger is the lie fostered by supernaturalism, namely, there is no hurry; God can wait; God will work His will in His own good time; be brave; survive this vale of tears; bliss will come after physical death in the next world.

Instead of obeying Jesus' commands, "First be reconciled with your brother . . . [and] . . . Seek first the kingdom," we have sought for reconciliation with an other-worldly God and have passed by on the other side of the road where God's children of the kingdom lie robbed, beaten, and dying. The great commandment is ignored, namely, loving the ideal of love through good Samaritan compassion and sacrificial service.

Reconciliation is still too much of a side issue. The Pharisee and the Hindu put love for the deity above all else, and held that charity should not be neglected whenever the opportunity arose. Jesus put love for a God of love first, and love for one's neighbor of equal value. According to Jesus, "On these two commandments [really one] hang all the law and the prophets . . ." all reconcili-

ation. Only love for God's children proves one's love for a God of love. And further, according to Jesus, the Golden Rule "is the law and the prophets . . .", is reconciliation.

According to Paul: "Now abide faith [over which there have always been controversies]; hope [through the many controversial ways in which we worship, we hope to make real our faith]; charity [over which there can be no difference of opinion]." We either love others with self-effacing love, or we do not. If our faith and the way we worship do not increase our love, our faith and ways of worship need revising.

The emphasis of so-called Holy Men and of the Church has centered on individual and national salvation. In spite of this un-Christlike emphasis, occasionally a St. Francis of Assisi, a Grenfell, a Kagawa, and a Schweitzer make humane values the main issue.

The tragedy is that gods have led to the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, Dictators, authoritarianism, which foster impotence in democratic procedure and reconciliation. Supernaturalism is a wet blanket on progress toward the brotherhood of man. Unsated Dinosauria of today would vanish without myth armor and war horns. Authority needs the supernatural as a man obsessed of the

paralysis of fear needs a hollow tree. But the supernatural is as insensible to man as a hollow tree. The Galileos are in jeopardy because their new-found truths upset the money-tables of the guardians of the status quo. We live in a confused age; we are still partially bound by the scare of treasonable McCarthyism. We need a new birth of Lowell's:

"Whatever we have dared
to think
That dare we also say."

Because reconciliation has been sidetracked we have been forced to resort to the F.O.R., the A.C.L.U., the Workers Defence League, the National Child Labor Committee, the N.A.A.C.P., C.O.R.E., special organizations for social action, the American Committee on Africa, Spanish Refugee Aid, the Prisoners Relief Fund, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, etc.

Too often, man has made a holy rite of his baser passions. Worse even than the ritual with the Temple Girls of India is the practice of making a religion out of man's immaturity—turning to supernaturalism as primitive man turned to the tribal medicine man. Small wonder reconciliation has been tardy in coming, as man has turned to orgies of inquisition, witchcraft, racism; to superstition, exploitation, poverty.

What is our goal—just a star or a galaxy? Will man always need supernatural props, police, courts, and gas chambers? Is the "Be perfect" command of Jesus an idle admonition? Is creative intelligence unattainable? Man dreams of flying; wings are born; he keeps them folded. An increasing number of serious-minded men with a growing edge are whetting their hope on the following humanist classic by Lafcadio Hearn from *Out of the East*.

Not a few of us feel that Western Faith must finally pass away forever, leaving us to our own resources when our mental manhood shall have been attained, even as the fondest of mothers must leave her children at last. In that far day her work will all have been done; she will have fully developed our recognition of certain eternal spiritual laws; she will have fully ripened our profounder human sympathies; she will have fully prepared us by her parables and fairy tales, by her gentler falsehoods, for the terrible truth of existence;—prepared us for the knowledge that there is no divine love save the love of man for man; that we have no All-Father, no Saviour, no angel guardians; that we have no possible refuge but in ourselves.

BOOKMAN'S NOTEBOOK

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS

FROM CRISIS TO CATASTROPHE?

Our own predilections, both by thought and congenitally perhaps, are to have great aversion to anyone crying "wolf" or casting concern for things in the form of "crisis." The reason is that very few human problems actually merit such a designation. Like with a physical disease (or so a doctor friend of ours once told us) 90 percent of all cases would be self-curative, if left alone. Of course one may need an expert to distinguish the ninety from the ten. At any rate, the souping up of a "crisis" is a too-easy way to indulge dramatic contrasts or work people up. But beyond a certain point, the more people get worked up, usually the less capacity they have to deal with it intelligently when, if the issue is serious, intelligence is precisely what it needs most. All of which is to make no bid for indifference, apathy, or lackadaisical blandness about matters of moment. It is only to argue that calmness should increase in direct proportion to gravity. An aid to calmness is complete exploration and analysis.

That we are in a crisis of an arms race does not now have to be argued. That there is a growing radiation hazard in some terms is also true. The political, economic, and moral issues of peace are getting more urgent. So much, perhaps no one will argue anymore. To us, it looks as though they will grow in intensity

during the next several years, in which perhaps our first effective opportunity to cast the leverage of a vote will be in the 1960 election. Most of the time in between might well be spent in getting an education about it.

Two books in particular are eminently worth reading at the moment. They are the publication of March 3, 1958, of George Kennan's Reith lectures over BBC, entitled: *Russia, the Atom, and the West*, and the slightly older *Nuclear Weapons and American Foreign Policy*, by Henry Kissinger. Never in the history of BBC, says Max Freedman, Washington correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, were any lectures so famous. Incidentally, the substance of the lectures is contained in articles by Kennan, in the February and March issues of the *Atlantic*. A further discussion of them is in the April issue in an article by Walter Lippmann. Kennan says a number of things: that now is another favorable time to get something done vis-a-vis the Russians; summit meetings are not necessarily the answer but tangible negotiation points are; one of these, and crucial to him, is Germany. On Germany (as well as the Middle East and the Far East) he feels we have been standing on a non-negotiable position. He proposes to unify Germany at the price of limiting her future freedom militarily; in short, no army, no NATO relation-

ship. Only thus can we roll the Russian armies out of East Germany and the satellites. What we would give for this is to take American troops out of all Europe. The two colossi of the world, the United States and Russia, would thus disengage in Europe. Kennan says he cannot overemphasize the danger of putting any kind of nuclear armament in the hands of the smaller European nations, allies or not. He can be misinterpreted as a radical "cut-downer" on foreign aid. But we did not get that so much, as a both more hardheaded and liberal attitude. Hardheaded in refusing to be blackmailed ("if you don't help us we'll look to Russia" attitude, to which Kennan would say, "go look"); but more liberal in not requiring it to be tied to military pacts, not requiring abrogating even normal relations with Russia, and not to be worried if the economy we helped was "socialistic."

Although even the most sympathetic critics on the continent and in this country cannot accept all his points, he has had an enormous public in Europe (which we hope is repeated here). Why? Lippmann suggests that Kennan's policy looks so good just because Dulles, Macmillan, and Adenauer have not any. Which is not altogether left-handed in compliment either. It is a contribution to bring forth a comprehensive, intelligent, and concrete set of proposals. And further, proposals which, as Lippmann says, are the first to recognize the new power realities in the world since Russia has an H-bomb and is well-developed in ICBM's.

In *Nuclear Weapons and American Foreign Policy*, Kissinger is not concerned with developing a programmatic policy in diplomacy. It is more of an analysis of the relationship of the military to diplomacy. Here, with completeness of detail, and utterly remorseless (and, to us, unanswerable) logic, he develops exactly how and why our so-called policy of "massive retaliation" is in utter bankruptcy. Kennan has some of this, too, and so far these men are in agreement. Kissinger develops it much more completely. The two men would diverge however on another point. Kissinger believes in a drastic military reorganization and the development of a complete tactical arm, to complement our present strategic arm. We are compelled by both morality and the threat of suicide not to use the strategic arm. This leaves our diplomacy impotent. Kennan would disagree with this whole idea of the possibility of conducting "brush-fire wars" and would hold that from now on there is great danger that the little ones will become big ones.

Perhaps a larger share of the debate in this country, where the issues are debated at all, concerns approaches to limit nuclear testing. On this there are several items of reading fairly essential to a balanced viewpoint. One is *The Effects of Atomic Radiation*, published by the AEC and obtainable from the U.S. Government Printing Office for \$2. This is a lot of book for the money. (Incidentally, although not in this field, so is another for the same price from the same source, *Soviet Professional Manpower*, which is a mine

of information on that subject.) It contains a lot of information not available even a year ago. It appears to be both exhaustive and candid. It is certainly more complete than Dr. Teller's recent book. All kinds of effects of radiation are dealt with, and also it goes completely into the bio-chemistry of the absorption of strontium-90 into plants, and from thence to animals, etc.

Somewhat more to the point, however, for quick reading is the January 1958 special issue of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*. The entire issue is devoted to "Radiation and Man." This journal is getting to be, if it is not in fact, pretty much a "must" for perusal anyway. In any case do look up this particular one. The opening long editorial by the editor, Eugene Rabinowitz, is quite interesting. The reasons for various scientists objecting to nuclear testing are wider than commonly supposed. There are in general four:

1. Radiation harm to humanity.
2. A feasible way to make a beginning in the disarmament deadlock.
3. Prevent the development of nuclear war heads for missiles.
4. Prevent tests from getting far enough so that smaller nations might be able to get into the act.

Rabinowitz' own conclusion, to which presumably others adhered, was that the most valid reasons were the last two, but that now these have gone by the board. Once a ban on nuclear testing served a purpose. Now, sadly, it does not. Obviously the war heads for missiles are on the way, and Raymond Aron, the French political analyst, has predicted that Sweden and Switzerland will have

nuclear devices in less than ten years.

The more ticklish area, however, is the apparent ambiguity in technical opinion on the matter of the harmfulness of testing up to this time, or at the present rate, to human beings. The rest of that issue of the *Bulletin* backs up this judgment, as incidentally does the data in the Kissinger book. This is one of the staples of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. They are working with minority scientific opinion apparently, as well as against the fact that neutrals who have any possibility of testing a device themselves are more impatient to get in the act, than feeling hurt by fallout. Which does not necessarily destroy the committee's case, but it complicates it. Their chief other leg is that this is a way to make a break in the disarmament deadlock. Rabinowitz cannot see that it will, and if it does not, then, of course, by itself it is not of much value.

On one thing there is massive agreement, namely, that a war of atomic weapons would poison the Northern Hemisphere so extremely as to effect fantastic casualties by immediate radiation effect and would also produce short-run genetic effects, which then become part of the biological inheritance of the race. Does testing—particularly of anti-missile missiles with atomic war heads, as for example being involved in our current Johnson Island testing (anti-missile missiles "zeroing in" on missiles and even if not hitting directly, destroying everything in a cubic mile of air, and therefore hopefully effective)—actually buy

further time for "peace" by its development of the "deterrent of active defense" to keep pace with the "deterrent by retaliation"?

This would seem to be the issue to debate—this or outright pacifism. The latter is growing in England, as it is somewhat in the United States, although nowhere nearly as high yet as it was in the thirties. Various passages in Kennan's book have been taken to show his sympathy with this, or with unilateral disarmament. When censured for this by critics, he has been at pains to deny both.

Several more inexpensive publications are useful in this research. One is Doubleday's *Can We Meet the Russians Half-Way* (a \$1.50 paperback), edited by Chalmers Roberts of the *Washington Post*, which is quite a collection of statements by Khrushchev, Eisenhower, Adenauer, Dulles, Macmillan, et al; heads of state and opposition parties; news analysts—European and American; and the like. There is nothing heavyweight about it, but it gives one a good quick survey of the surfaces of officialdom. More useful for general background is another book by Kennan, *American Diplomacy 1900-1950*. This is available in Mentor paperbacks. Brief though it is, it helps in that all important sense of perspective of the times. The final chapters on Russia since the war further argue his conviction of finding some kind of an attitude towards them somewhere in between that of beasts or angels. On subjects like this and on Anglo-American relations, he is a most persuasive writer. Since he is an old power-politics, self-interest-first type of

diplomat, the argument has more force and is better stated than by some others. In the same Mentor paperbacks is Walter Lippmann's *Public Policy*.

What lurks in all of this is a massive argument that maybe the weakest thing about the United States is that it has no comprehensive, long-range policy, even in military terms, let alone in political and economic. Kennan thinks the main threat is coming in the latter. Lippmann does not always conceal his disgust with our State Department. The final chapters of Kissinger's book are a brilliant essay, and almost a plea, to develop a plan. Various kinds of suggestions lie here and there through all of the items suggested in the reading above. Gather them all together and there would be a sizeable body of concrete propositions which might be worth promoting. A vacuum of discussion on it, however, seems to exist at the level of our State Department. Two days before writing this, a news account, unamplified, just said that we had rejected the Ripacki plan (The Polish plan for a nuclear free zone in Central Europe and a proposal tending in the area of Kennan's main idea). Maybe we have good and sound reasons for this. One apparently has to own a crystal ball to find them out. So getting an education designed to stimulate a grass-roots discussion, designed further to smoke out a top-level one, would seem to be an urgency.

We would register one dissent in this column, however, to the clique who go for C. Wright Mills and think the "Pagan Letter to the Christian Clergy" was wonder-

ful. Nobody is guiltless in all this, including Mr. Mills. Hearing him at Champaign-Urbana, and especially talking to him afterward, confirmed an initial suspicion.


Here is a left-wing Niebuhr, full of original sin for everyone but C. Wright Mills, and too much "above it all" for assuming constructive responsibility.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH, *Executive Secretary*

The Annual Meeting and Beyond

FTER one hundred and six years of history you would think the Western Unitarian Conference would have acquired a little suave sophistication. But no, as our Annual Meeting demonstrated, we still love our "hot" arguments over resolutions, and we still manage new and more complicated parliamentary tangles. Western Conference Unitarians cannot claim an "exclusive" in these eccentricities. At May Meetings we have a capable presiding officer, a parliamentarian and a lawyer, and have the same monumental hassles about rules of order. Anyway, we relish these experiences and have the refreshing experiences of kidding ourselves about them.

Rev. Arnold Westwood and Rev. Earle McKinney, ministers

of the merged Universalist-Unitarian Church of Urbana, their two committee-mates Bud Konzo and Bob Storm, worked long and hard on arrangements. Everything was well-taken care of, every contingency foreseen and provided for. The members of the church were the most gracious of hosts and indicated by their pride and air of confidence their deep satisfaction with having "brought off" a good merger. We had a good time in Urbana! So vigorous was the atmosphere all around us that someone certified that over the week end leaves burst through the ground and spring bulbs burst forth into full bloom. Something of the same ebullieny characterized our fellowship.

It was a most heartening thing to meet together with the Universalists of the Midwest Universalist Conference. We sensed in them

a fine excitement. We might have addressed this First Joint Conference to the serious business of Uni-Uni relations. Instead we ignored the subject and talked of common issues and interests. One result was that everyone assumed that to meet jointly was the natural thing to do. No one even raised the question: "Shall we do it again?" Seriously, we Uni's and Uni's are talking about sharing the same office building in Chicago. Also, we are both talking confidently of much more effective fund raising for denominational purposes.

The atmosphere of a great University seemed an appropriate setting. The use of University facilities; sharing a top flight speaker with the University group; participation in the hospitality and activities of the Channing-Murray Foundation, one of the finest student fellowships in our two denominations—these added greatly to the vitality and sense of "future" of our experience. We ought to be doing on a hundred, two hundred campuses the mature things the students, with Dick Kellaway and the two ministers, are doing at Urbana. Incidentally, seventy-two of our one hundred twenty-six Western Conference societies are in towns and cities where there are one or more colleges.

Dr. C. Wright Mills, as our

theme speaker, spoke forthrightly and was introduced forthrightly by Carl Storm of the Minneapolis Society. The Unitarian ministers who worry about the great diversity of their people should note that their own reactions ranged all the way from: "It was a rather dull speech" to "Vastly over-emotional" to "It's about time someone was laying it on the line like this!" It is a safe bet that no one will forget what Dr. Mills said. His address to us will appear as a chapter or two in a forthcoming book which will be available as a paperback. The arrangements to have it taped for loan to fellowships failed through someone's forgetfulness after Westwood-McKinney and Co., together with station WILL had worked out all the plans. Dr. Mills talked of "The Sources of World War III." Just the other night I heard Linus Pauling chant a recurring refrain: "How stupid can we get!"

There was much satisfaction with the many workshop sessions though the Friday afternoon orientation for them did not "come off." Royal Cloyd, new director of Adult Education for the Council of Liberal Churches, made his first contribution to Western Unitarianism by helping us plan the participation portions of the program. Royal was back home—he recently went to the Boston office from Urbana.

The speaker for the banquet session was Ernest Kuebler, the red-headed candidate for the Presidency of the A.U.A. and for some years the capable administrator of the Council of Liberal Churches. Ernest gave us a sober and constructive address on the opportunities before us as liberal religionists in a period of our most promising growth.

One thing we who plan these annual meetings assure you: we will go back to the rules concerning resolutions and remind the individual churches and fellowships well in advance that resolutions should be submitted weeks ahead of time. We promise also that there will be a period for discussion of resolutions before you are asked to vote on them.

New ministers of both denominations were introduced at the banquet, and ministers-to-be from the student body of the Meadville Theological School were active participants in all sessions. Attendance at the annual business meeting was more than double the attendance last year, and the overall registration reached a record high.

The Sunday morning worship service was an all-out experience of beauty, honesty, and profound meaning. Dr. Carleton Fisher, of Wausau, Wisconsin, the newly-elected President of the Universalist Church of America, gave us

a memorable sermon; the choir sang in inspired fashion and the sound of a large Unitarian-Universalist congregation singing hymns heartily was a rare delight.

Delegates were present from the Sauk City, Wisconsin, "Free Congregation—the Unitarian Fellowship," which has always been a layman-led fellowship and which was founded in the same year as the Western Conference itself. Present also was nearly the full membership of the Unitarian Church of Shelbyville, which has reorganized itself to function as a fellowship. The Shelbyville people were glowing with pride over their new experience.

Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, President of the Western Unitarian Conference and minister of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, gave a stimulating report in which he noted that the Program-Planning Committee of the Conference is in its eighth year of operation and that it has become a major influence in giving study and wise counsel to the overall program of the Conference. Mr. Buehrer emphasized his conviction that we are entering into the full responsibilities of freedom. "Our regionalism involves the strengthening and local implementation of the splendid religious education program of our denomination. Our regionalism involves the prosecution of strong

college centers programs. Our regionalism is involved in fund raising which seeks to be adequate to provide the services Western Conference Unitarians have voted for. Our regionalism involves Unitarian extension to serve the people who are seeking us without knowing whom they seek."

Rev. John Brigham, reporting for the Program-Planning Committee said that our most serious problem is fund raising. It is a national and a regional problem. Dr. Randall Hilton, our Treasurer, hinted that while the nation is experiencing a depression, the Conference is going through a rolling readjustment.

The Conference has spent more money this year and has gone over its budget primarily for additional Board and Committee meetings, for postage, and for office equipment. The Secretary's travel in this first full year of his service has cost more.

Mrs. Jeanne Kuch, reporting for the Religious Education Committee, said that five years ago there were 3,500 children enrolled in Western Conference Church Schools and today 9,000. Five years ago 470 adults were involved in our religious education programs and today 1,300. The purpose of the committee is to provide adequate services to this boom. A happy note is that we have graduated from an ancient

hand-cranked mimeograph to a nearly-new rebuilt electric machine. All but one of our eight Area Conferences now have Religious Education Committees.

It is significant that at each annual meeting the role of the Area (or sub-regional) Conferences is obviously larger and a more important part of our total effort.

No one will forget Harry Burns of Denver, formerly of Cincinnati, urging us to attend the First annual Rocky Mountain Unitarian-Universalist Summer Assembly at Estes Park, August 22-25.

You can write in care of the Unitarian Church in Denver for information, though circulars will reach all the churches and fellowships in abundance. The "cow hands" who make up the liberal religious rank-and-file in the Rocky Mountain area will help you plan your sightseeing in the mountains after the Estes Assembly. Harry said: "We're lonesome out there. We're hoping some of you will spend your vacations with us!"

Incidentally, next year's Annual Meeting will be held in Denver, April 17-20. Bring your beards with you—Denver will be celebrating its one-hundredth anniversary.

The Lake Geneva Planning Council announced a full program for the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly at Lake Geneva,